Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/585,809	FLEISCHER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sunray R. Chang	2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 July 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *22-41* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-21* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *22-41* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *22-41* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *13 July 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *20060713, 20080417*.
4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. *20090225*.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 – WWW.USPTO.GOV

Examiner's Detailed Office Action

1. This Office Action is responsive to communication, filed on July 13th, 2006.

Claims 22 – 41 are submitted for examination;

Claims 1 – 21 have been cancelled;

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted to disclose 37 C.F.R. 1.56 all pertinent information and material pertaining to the patentability of applicant's claimed invention, on July 13th, 2006 and April 17th, 2008 have been considered by the examiner.

Drawings

3. The formal drawings submitted have been reviewed by the Office of Initial Patent Examination (OIPE) and/or the USPTO Office of Draftperson's Patent Drawings Review.

Claim Objection

4. Claim 31 is objected under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. See the rejection to independent claims as indicated below

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention.

As to (in)dependent claim 30, the limitation "the input" has been rejected for insufficient antecedent basis in the claim, which has not been previously cited.

Election/Restrictions

6. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 22 – 35 and 38 – 41, drawn to a method for controlling material flow in production, classified in class 700, subclass 116.

II. Claims 36 and 37, drawn to handling of a good, classified in class 70, subclass 278.3.

Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06).

The examiner further explains, since the claim language is so broad which the "handling of a good" can be read as simply controlling/manipulating a device; both inventions have been rejected in current office action as indicated below.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a

serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

(a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;

(b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;

(c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);

(d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;

(e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) **and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention**.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

During a telephone conversation with Brett Valiquet on February 25th, 2009, a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of I, claims 36 and 37. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 36 and 37 have been withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

7. Claims 36 and 37 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claims. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the examiner initialed interview on February 25th, 2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. **Claim(s) 22 – 26, 28 – 31** and **38 – 41** is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Heiner Reihl et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,742, and referred to as **Reihl** hereinafter).

Regarding **claim(s) 22 – 26, 28 – 34, 38, 40** and **41**, **Reihl** teaches a system, computer product, method, comprising:

- controlling material flow in production, **or** consumable **or** replacement part maintenance of a product comprised of a plurality of individual parts [assure the correct delivery of consumables in printer and copier devices in order to be able to process consumables of different types in the devices, col. 2, lines 28 – 31], comprising the steps of:
- respectively delivering the individual parts to a goods receipt of a logistic system [9, 11 fig. 2; sum of those data that are transmitted via the write station 11 into the transponder 13 are simultaneously entered into a data bank 9 within the filling station 3, col. 7, lines 24 – 28; the cleaned and tested containers are intermediately stored in a warehouse, col. 7, lines 13 – 15], a transponder being associated with each individual part [a transponder is employed as information carrier. Such electronic components usually carry a permanently allocated, individual coding, col. 3, line 66 – col. 4, line 3], and

- in the transponder are stored production and delivery data regarding the individual part, said production and delivery data comprising quality data; [After the end of the filling procedure, the necessary, variable data such as type of toner and toner fill quantity are transmitted into the variable memory areas of the transponder 13 as well as into the data bank, col. 7, lines 45 – 48]
- reading data of the transponder at the goods receipt and using the data for controlling further material flow such that the individual parts are transported in a controlled manner to predetermined, subsequent process stations; [After cleaning, the containers 2--in a position 2/5--pass through a testing station 6 at which they are checked for mechanical damage as well as for leaks. The leak test occurs with a compressed air unit. Subsequently, the cleaned and tested containers 2 are intermediately stored in a warehouse 7 (2/6). Containers that are to be filled with toner are supplied directly to the filling station 3; containers that are to be re-employed as waste disposal containers are supplied directly to the transport vehicle 10 that outputs the containers in the direction to the printing center. For distinguishing between toner supply containers and waste disposal containers, these are correspondingly identified as toner or waste supply containers in the transponder, col. 7, lines 11 – 23] and
- reading out a plurality of transponders that are commonly housed in a transport unit substantially simultaneously at the goods receipt with a detection device. [containers 2 are delivered with a transport vehicle 10 and are pre-selected in a position 2/2 with the data of the transponder 13, col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 9; **claim 31** is also rejected in this item]

Regarding **claim(s) 23**, **Reihl** teaches the method for controlling material flow according to claim 22 wherein

- for monitoring of quality of the product further quality data are stored in the transponder at quality check stations for at least one of the individual parts, for aggregates, or for aggregate parts that are comprised of a plurality of individual parts. [identification data stored in the PROM area of the transponder 13 and/or the encoded key data are read out and potentially checked for correctness on the basis of earlier data container in the data bank, col. 7, lines 36 – 40]

Regarding **claim(s) 24**, **Reihl** teaches the method according to claim 22 wherein

- at least one group of the individual parts is a mass production article that is delivered at the goods receipt in a quantity of more than five in a container, [7, fig. 2] and wherein

the container comprises

- the transponder in which is stored a common quality score regarding the group of mass production articles of the container. [Containers that are to be filled with toner are supplied directly to the filling station 3; containers that are to be re-employed as waste disposal containers are supplied directly to the transport vehicle 10 that outputs the containers in the direction to the printing center, col. 7, lines 16 – 20]

Regarding **claim(s) 25**, **Reihl** teaches the method according to claim 24 wherein

- information about a quantity of the plurality of the articles located in the container is additionally stored in the transponder. [… these are correspondingly identified as toner or

waste supply containers in the transponder, col. 7, lines 16 – 22; the examiner explains, quantity can be simply "to be filled" or "re-employed" as disclosed by **Reihl** reference]

Regarding **claim(s) 26**, **Reihl** teaches the method according to claim 22 wherein

- at least one of reading **or** writing of data at the transponder occurs with a mobile computer [an antenna via which a wireless data transfer to a read station 65 can occur, col. 11, lines 6 – 11; 26a, microcontroller, fig. 8; since the "mobile computer" does not have further limitations for the "mobile computer", **Reihl** reference teaches a read station which can be used for wirelessly reading or writing data with the transponder] that comprises
- a first interface for wireless communication with the transponder and a second interface for communication with a computer network. [an antenna via which a wireless data transfer to a read station 65 can occur. The read station 65 can be optionally secured to the developer station 14 or to the printer housing and is connected to the process control arrangement 40 via a cable connection (for example, CAN bus), col. 11, lines 6 – 11]

Regarding **claim(s) 28**, **Reihl** teaches the method according to claim 22 wherein

- at least one individual part is **housed** in a package and the transponder is attached on the package. [13, 2/1, fig. 1; the examiner further explains, one individual part of a housing can be item "2/1" and item "13" is the transponder which is attached on the package]

Regarding **claim(s) 29**, **Reihl** teaches the method according to claim 22 wherein

- an aggregate-related transponder is added to an aggregate, and data about the aggregate are stored in the transponder. [… display static information … the type of consumable … updating of the quantity of consumable contained in the container are suitable as information carrier rigidly connected to the container … in particular, transponders are also suitable for this purpose, col. 3, lines 53 – 65; the container can be an "aggregate"]

Regarding **claim(s) 30**, **Reihl** teaches the method according to claim 22 wherein

- the input is recorded at the goods receipt by means of the transponder data. [data stored in the transponder can be supplied to other system components such as a filling station, a central computer with a data bank, and the printer or copier devices, Abstract; 9, 11 fig. 2; sum of those data that are transmitted via the write station 11 into the transponder 13 are simultaneously entered into a data bank 9 within the filling station 3, col. 7, lines 24 – 28]

Regarding **claim(s) 32**, **Reihl** teaches the method according to claim 22 wherein

- the data belonging to an individual part and stored on its associated transponder, are stored on a transponder located on a finished, assembled product. [Table one in col. 15 – col. 16; the examiner further explains, having "←" between "data at/in Printer" and "Data at the Container" is the data belonging to an individual part and stored on a assembled product]

Regarding **claim(s) 33**, **Reihl** teaches the method according to claim 22 wherein

- additional data regarding at least one of the recycling or the disposal are stored in a transponder associated with an individual part, an aggregate part, **or** an aggregate.

[distinguishing between toner supply containers and waste disposal containers, these are correspondingly identified as toner or waste supply containers in the transponder, col. 7, lines 20 – 23]

Regarding **claim(s) 34**, **Reihl** teaches the method according to claim 22 wherein

- the data are at least one of recorded, stored or generated in a computer program [the toner type, the color thereof as well as the filling level of the container are, for example, binarily encoded in the memory (EEPROM) of the toner supply container and are thus stored in machine-readable form, col. 11, lines 16 – 20] and
- at least one of the material flow **or** production process are controlled by a computer. [The filling procedure is controlled by a filling computer (microprocessor 52) that is connected via a suitable data line or, respectively, via a network connection to a central computer 51 that contains the data bank 9, col. 14, lines 8 – 12; assure the correct delivery of consumables in printer and copier devices in order to be able to process consumables of different types in the devices, col. 2, lines 28 – 31]

Regarding **claim(s) 39**, **Reihl** teaches the method according to claim 38 wherein

- the delivery data in the transponder are transmitted from a computer of a supplier production site to a computer of the logistic system via a remote data connection. [fig. 10a, 10b; The filling procedure is controlled by a filling computer (microprocessor 52) that is connected via a suitable data line or, respectively, via a network connection to a central computer 51 that contains the data bank 9. A testing stand sensor 53 (scale or capacitative height sensor)

measures the quantity of toner currently contained in the container 2 and reports the status signal to the microprocessor 52. The latter controls a controllable discharge valve 54. Via a data network, for example via a local area network LAN, via a wide area network WAN or via an Internet connection, the computer 51 can be connected to one or more controllers of printer devices into which the filled toner containers are introduced for printing, col. 14, lines 3 – 24]

The examiner further explains, the delivery data in the transponder has been defined as delivered by the transponder in the independent claim 38, "reading data of the transponder at the goods receipt and using the data for controlling further material flow such that the individual parts are transported in a controlled manner to predetermined, subsequent process stations, yet, the delivery data in the transponder is delivered by remote data connection through the usage of two computers. The Applicants are requested to explain more detail regarding this issue in response.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. **Claim(s) 35 is/are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Reihl** reference and in view of Ruth Frank (U.S. P.G. Pub. No. 2002/0179484, and referred to as **Frank** hereinafter) and further in view of Uwe Hansmann et al. (U.S. P.G. Pub. No. 2001/0024157, and referred to as **Hansmann** hereinafter).

Reihl teaches,

- controlling material flow in production, **or** consumable **or** replacement part maintenance of a product comprised of a plurality of individual parts [assure the correct delivery of consumables in printer and copier devices in order to be able to process consumables of different types in the devices, col. 2, lines 28 – 31], comprising the steps of:
- respectively delivering the individual parts to a goods receipt of a logistic system [9, 11 fig. 2; sum of those data that are transmitted via the write station 11 into the transponder 13 are simultaneously entered into a data bank 9 within the filling station 3, col. 7, lines 24 – 28; the cleaned and tested containers are intermediately stored in a warehouse, col. 7, lines 13 – 15], a transponder being associated with each individual part [a transponder is employed as information carrier. Such electronic components usually carry a permanently allocated, individual coding, col. 3, line 66 – col. 4, line 3], and
- in the transponder are stored production and delivery data regarding the individual part, said production and delivery data comprising quality data; [After the end of the filling procedure, the necessary, variable data such as type of toner and toner fill quantity are transmitted into

the variable memory areas of the transponder 13 as well as into the data bank, col. 7, lines 45 – 48]

- reading data of the transponder at the goods receipt and using the data for controlling further material flow such that the individual parts are transported in a controlled manner to predetermined, subsequent process stations; [After cleaning, the containers 2--in a position 2/5--pass through a testing station 6 at which they are checked for mechanical damage as well as for leaks. The leak test occurs with a compressed air unit. Subsequently, the cleaned and tested containers 2 are intermediately stored in a warehouse 7 (2/6). Containers that are to be filled with toner are supplied directly to the filling station 3; containers that are to be re-employed as waste disposal containers are supplied directly to the transport vehicle 10 that outputs the containers in the direction to the printing center. For distinguishing between toner supply containers and waste disposal containers, these are correspondingly identified as toner or waste supply containers in the transponder, col. 7, lines 11 – 23] and

Reihl further teaches a production site [respective printing location, Abstract]

Reihl does not teach taking in parts by an operator and storing them in a storage until they are required; detecting a removal of an individual part from the storage or with a transponder reader; triggering a payment obligation for the operator upon removal of the individual part from the storage;

Frank teaches,

- taking in the individual parts by a production site operator and storing them in a production site storage until they are required for production; [a patient or resident is thus able to

associate the identifying feature or label design with the actual personal item which should be placed in a given compartment or storage feature, component or device, [0034]] and

- detecting a removal of an individual part from the production site storage or its assembly in an aggregate of the product with a transponder reader [transmits a missing item condition signal to a central receiving station or computer the presence or absence of items in each compartment. Additional controls can also be added to vary the type and detection timing of individual personal item sensing units. Sensing units can also consist of passive transponders attached to each personal item stored on the tray, [0043]] for the purpose of identification, placement, retention, storage, removal and/or accounting of personal items belonging to individuals, such as patients, [0001]]

Hansmann has been further cited for teaching triggering a payment obligation [the device includes the contactless reader for reading information stored in the contactless label chipcard, and a component for generating an invoice based on the information received from the contactless label chipcard, Abstract] for accomplishing an easy check-out with enhanced security [0002].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of **Reihl** to include "taking in parts by an operator and storing them in a storage until they are required; detecting a removal of an individual part from the storage or with a transponder reader; triggering a payment obligation for the operator upon removal of the individual part from the storage", for the purpose of identification, placement, retention, storage, removal and/or accounting of personal items belonging to

individuals, such as patients, [**Frank**, 0001]] and for accomplishing an easy check-out with enhanced security [**Hansmann**, 0002].

10. **Claim(s) 27 is/are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Reihl** reference.

Reihl teaches,

Regarding **claim(s) 27**, **Reihl** teaches the method according to claim 26 wherein

- a communication occurs via the computer network interface. [a data network, for example via a local area network LAN, via a wide area network WAN or via an Internet connection, col. 14, lines 16 – 20]

Reihl reference does not teach, the network is wirelessly connected;

However, it is well know in the art that "wireless" is a cable replacement connection, since there is a network disclosed by **Reihl** reference, it is well know can be replaced by a wireless connection.

Further Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. **Claim(s) 36** and **37** is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by David C. Janssen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,433,096, and referred to as **Janssen** hereinafter).

Regarding **claim(s) 36**,

Janssen teaches,

A method for handling of a good, comprising the steps of:

- associating with the good a transponder [a key assembly and more particularly to the mounting of an electronic component in the key. The electronic component is preferably a transponder for an RFID electronic interlock system for an automobile ignition lock, and preferably the transponder is mounted in the head of the key, col. 2, lines 8 – 13] and wherein
- data about at least one of the good **or** a handling of the good are at least one of read or stored in the transponder. [When transponder 2 is to be read, key 4 is inserted into the keyway of ignition lock 1 and turned to close the automobile ignition switch. Battery voltage is thus applied to the engine control module which turns on the RFID ignition module causing the reader to send out a 134.2 KHz power pulse to antenna 3 lasting approximately 50 milliseconds. Antenna 3 thus generates a relatively high energy radio frequency field. This field is received by a coil or antenna (not shown) in transponder 2 that is tuned to the same frequency, and converted to DC voltage by a bridge rectifier in transponder 2, col. 4, lines 43 – 53]

Regarding **claim(s) 37**, a method according to claim 36 wherein

- the data about the handling comprise delivery data. [transmits a unique RF identification code or signal back to the reader via antenna 3. The reader then translates the ID code into a digital form and forwards the digital ID code to the logic circuit which verifies that the ID signal is a valid ID signal, col. 4, lines 19 – 26]

Correspondence Information

12. Any inquires concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sunray Chang, who may be reached Monday through Friday, between 6:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. EST. or via telephone at (571) 272-3682 or facsimile transmission (571) 273-3682 or email sunray.chang@uspto.gov.

If you need to send an Official facsimile transmission, please send it to (571) 273-8300.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful in the regular office hour, the Examiner's Supervisor, Albert Decady, may be reached at (571) 272-3819.

Hand-delivered responses should be delivered to the Receptionist @ (Customer Service Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22313), located on the first floor of the south side of the Randolph Building.

Finally, information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Moreover, status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) toll-free @ 1-866-217-9197.

Sunray Chang
Art Unit 2121
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office

/Albert DeCady/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2121

March 4, 2009
